

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/466,325	BRISCOE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian J. Sines	1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian J. Sines. (3)_____

(2) D. Gilmore. (4)_____

Date of Interview: 31 January 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,6-8,10-12,14-23 and 26-35.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hayes et al., Wilding et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner suggested that the applicant file claims directed to the method of making the device using green-sheet layer technology. An RCE for this case will be filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required